DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 870 HE 008 177

AUTHOR Bukowski, Joseph E.
TITLE College Governance: A Comparison of Faculty Evaluation in Public and Private Colleges with Implications for the Improvement of the Evaluation Process at Johnson and Wales College.
PUB DATE 25 Feb 75
NOTE 29p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Assessment; *Effective Teaching; *Faculty Evaluation; *Governance; *Higher Education; Questionnaires; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Surveys; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Johnson and Wales College

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on selected factors in the evaluation of faculty members in: (1) colleges accredited by the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools; (2) public junior and senior colleges; and (3) Rhode Island colleges. Results of the study indicate that faculty evaluation schemes must follow the basic goals and philosophy of the institution. Nearly all respondents indicated that faculty evaluation was used on a formal basis. The study concluded with appropriate recommendations for the implementation of a formal system of faculty evaluation. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED127870

A COMPARISON OF FACULTY EVALUATION IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COLLEGES WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE EVALUATIVE PROCESS AT JOHNSON & WALES COLLEGE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

by

Joseph E. Bukowski, M.A.

Johnson & Wales College

Dr. Betty Ann Metz, Cluster Coordinator

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

February 25, 1975

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE008177

ABSTRACT

The study focused on selected factors in the evaluation of faculty members in (1) Colleges accredited by the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools; (2) Public junior and senior colleges; (3) Rhode Island colleges.

Results of the study indicated that faculty evaluation schemes must follow the basic goals and philosophy of the institution. Nearly all respondents indicated that faculty evaluation was used on a formal basis.

The study concluded with appropriate recommendations for the implementation of a formal system of faculty evaluation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES..... iii

INTRODUCTION..... 1.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE..... 2.

PROCEDURES..... 4.

RESULTS..... 5.

RECOMMENDATIONS..... 19.

SELECTED REFERENCES..... 21.

APPENDIXES:

A. SURVEY COVER LETTER ..... 22.

B. QUESTIONNAIRE ..... 23.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	RESPONSE TO EXISTANCE OF FORMAL SYSTEM OF FACULTY EVALUATION	6.
II.	SUMMARY OF NON-FORMAL EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES	7.
III.	PURPOSES OF FACULTY EVALUATION	8.
IV.	COMPONENTS OF THE EVALUATIVE PROCESS	9.
V.	METHODS OF EVALUATING TEACHING	12.
VI.	RESPONSIBILITY FOR EVALUATION	13.
VII.	RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLASSROOM VISITATIONS	14.
VIII.	DURATION OF CLASSROOM VISITATIONS	15.
IX.	ATTRIBUTES OF STUDENT EVALUATION	16.
X.	ORIGIN OF FACULTY EVALUATION	17.
XI.	FACULTY AWARENESS OF EVALUATIVE PROCESS	18.

INTRODUCTION

The problem of faculty evaluation has been written about for years. Still, there exists today very little consensus with respect to the goals of and criteria of faculty evaluation. A recent article in the literature points out the need for a systematic method of evaluating faculty(Sikking, 1973, page 60):

> "The most critical problem confronted in the social organization of any university is the proper evaluation of faculty services" (Wilson, 1942).
>
> "If higher educations are serious about improving the quality of teaching, they must demonstrate their interest in doing so by building an appraisal of teaching ability into their procedures" (Howe, 1967).

According to Sikkink (1973), the fact that the previous two comments are seperated by twenty-five years depicts the fact that universal faculty evaluation is still needed.

Brawer and Cohen(1972) describe the present state of faculty evaluation in their recent publication(Brawer and Cohen, 1972):

> "We know little about the factors in 'good' evaluation of junior college instructors. One reason for the dearth of information is that in the extensive material devoted to assessment, . the evaluation of college teaching has not received the critical attention it deserves and needs. In fact, although much lip service is paid to the importance of the good instructor, few criteria for appraising the quality of college teaching have been established."

"This may be in part because it is difficult to find out very much what goes on in the college teacher's classroom. Traditionally, that place has been sacrosanct; what transpires there has remained exclusively the teacher's business."

"However, although most research on rating instructors has concentrated on the elementary and secondary levels of education, the protests of many groups-particularly students - is forcing a change. And, whether he likes it or not, the college instructor is going to be assessed."

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

As a private institution, the administration of Johnson & Wales College must continuously examine its financial and human resources. The proper utilization of resources is the lifeblood of a private institution since public funding is not existant. Students who are the clientele of the college, are in constant touch with the faculty. This experience, in itself, has great implications for the future of the institution. Satisfied customers produce new customers. If a student feels that he has been properly prepared in his chosen discipline, he will recommend the institution to friends and relatives.

It is incumbent upon the administration of the college to be aware of what is going on in the classroom. Are students being properly prepared in their fields? Is the faculty providing up-to-date instruction using the most effecient instructional methodology?

Independent business colleges have traditionally employed faculty members on a basis of practical experience rather than on the basis of educational level attained. They are evaluated more on their ability to hold student interest(Katz, 1973).

Many writers have observed that a widespread assumption has been made that those who have developed expertise in their field will be able to teach others the same concepts and skills. This writer feels that this assumption is not universally acceptable since the key to effective teaching should be based on extensive preparation in the subject matter area plus a demonstrated ability to teach effectively through the proper use of instructional methods. Katz(1973) remarked further that faculty in proprietary institutions may be handicapped by understanding in pedagogy and by lack of sympathy for disadvantaged students.

The present system of faculty evaluation in use at the college consists of a five criteria format. Of the five points, one centers on effective teaching while the remaining points focus on institutional priorities such as loyalty to the college and versatility. The present system is primarily used as a tool for decision making in the retention of faculty, promotion of faculty and awarding of merit pay. Faculty members are not aware of their rating since the evaluative process is conducted by the five department chairpersons, the academic dean, and the vice-president of the college in closed sessions

Since the faculty is not aware of the ratings, most labor under the impression that their performance is acceptable. Very rarely is criticism made of faculty performance, especially in the area of effective instruction.

The problem, therefore, is to determine effective faculty evaluation models in use today with the expectation that the process of faculty evaluation and development at Johnson & Wales may be improved.

PROCEDURES

In order to ascertain faculty evaluation systems in use today a survey of one hundred and fourteen junior and senior colleges was conducted. The colleges were distributed as follows:

1. All fifty two junior and senior colleges accredited by the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools, of which Johnson & Wales College is a member;
2. Fifty-two junior and senior colleges randomly selected from the same geographic area as those above;
3. Ten colleges in the state of Rhode Island.

The purpose of the survey was to compare certain aspects of faculty evaluation in:

1. Junior and senior colleges accredited by the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools(AICS);
2. Public junior and senior colleges;
3. All Rhode Island colleges.

The aspects of evaluation which the survey examined were:

1. Is faculty evaluation conducted on a formal basis;
2. In cases where faculty evaluation was not conducted on a formal basis, what form did it take;
3. The purpose of faculty evaluation;

4. Areas of evaluation;
5. Methods of evaluating teaching;
6. Those responsible for evaluation;
7. Those responsible for classroom visitations;
8. Duration of classroom visitations:
9. Faculty awareness of evaluative criteria;
10. Attributes of student evaluation of faculty;
11. Whether faculty evaluation is required by law, union agreement, or optional;
12. Faculty awareness of the evaluative process results.

A copy of the survey and cover letter sent to colleges is contained in the appendix.

RESULTS

Of one hundred and fourteen surveys mailed to junior and senior colleges sixty-eight were returned for a response rate of fifty-nine and six tenths percent(59.6%). Five of the surveys were returned without response since the college had either closed or had merged with another institution. Therefore, sixty-three surveys were usable for a rate of fifty-five and two-tenths percent(55.2%).

SYSTEMS OF FACULTY EVALUATION

Table I. summarizes the responses relative to whether a formal system of faculty evaluation was being employed. Of the three groups surveyed, the AICS group indicated the lowest percentage of positive responses. Seven out of eight Rhode Island colleges indicated that a formal system of faculty evaluation is utilized.

TABLE I.

RESPONSE TO EXISTANCE OF FORMAL SYSTEM OF FACULTY EVALUATION

COLLEGE	POSITIVE NO.	POSITIVE %	NEGATIVE NO.	NEGATIVE %
AICS	19	73.1%	7	26.9%
Public	26	78.8%	7	21.2%
Rhode Island	7	85.8%	1	14.2%
TOTAL	52	77.6%	15	22.4%

A number of colleges indicated procedures employed to evaluate faculty members which are employed on a non-formal basis. A summary of thes procedures is presented on the following page.

TABLE II.

SUMMARY OF NON-FORMAL EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

AICS	PUBLIC
1. Classroom visitations	1. Informal observation
2. Student feedback	2. Varies
3. General observation	
4. Individual conferences	
5. Subjective evaluation by administrators	

In several institutions it was reported that a formal system of faculty evaluation was being developed. A majority of institutions reporting a non-formal evaluative process indicated that evaluation consisted of general observation, student feedback and classroom visits.

PURPOSE OF FACULTY EVALUATION

Of sixty-three colleges responding, eighty-five percent(85%) indicated that retention was one of the purposes of the evaluative process. Retention thus ranked as the most frequently mentioned purpose with awarding superior teaching the least frequently mentioned purpose with a response rate of seventeen and five tenths percent(17.5%). Table III. summarizes the response to the purpose of the system of faculty evaluation.

TABLE III.

PURPOSE OF FACULTY EVALUATION

PURPOSE	(N=26) AICS NO.	%	(N=30) PUBLIC NO.	%	(N=7) RHODE ISLAND NO.	%	(N=63) TOTAL NO.	%
RETENTION	21	80.8%	26	86.7%	7	100%	54	85.7%
PROMOTION	16	61.5%	24	80.0%	5	71.4%	45	71.4%
SALARY	14	53.8%	16	53.3%	3	42.9%	33	52.3%
DEVELOPMENT	17	65.4%	24	80.0%	5	71.4%	46	73.0%
MERIT PAY	3	11.5%	15	50.0%	2	28.6%	20	31.7%
AWARD SUPERIOR TEACHING	4	15.4%	7	23.3%	0	0	11	17.5%
FACULTY INDIV-IDUAL GROWTH	16	61.5%	19	63.3%	2	28.6%	37	58.7%
OTHER	3	11.5%	4	13.3%	0	0	7	11.1%

Of the sixty three responses only one college indicated a singular purpose for faculty evaluation. The most frequent combination consisted of the following:

(1) AICS - four stated purposes - 34.7%

(2) Public Colleges - four, five and six purposes - 20%

(3) Rhode Island Colleges - two purposes - 42.8%

COMPONENTS OF EVALUATION

As was expected, all respondents indicated that teaching was one area considered within the evaluative process. All sixty three responses indicated teaching as a component. Counseling students and institutional service ranked second to teaching in total responses. Table IV. presents data concerning the components of the evaluative process.

TABLE IV.

COMPONENTS OF THE EVALUATIVE PROCESS

COMPONENT	(N=26) AICS NO.	%	(N=30) PUBLIC NO.	%	(N=7) RHODE ISLAND NO.	%	(N=63) TOTAL NO.	%
TEACHING	26	100%	30	100%	7	100%	63	100%
COUNSELING	17	65.4%	19	63.3%	3	42.9%	39	61.9%
RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION	3	11.5%	11	36.7%	4	57.1%	18	28.6%
INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE	8	30.8%	26	86.7%	5	71.4%	39	61.9%
ADVISING	8	30.8%	15	50.0%	2	14.3%	25	39.7%
COMMUNITY SERVICE	6	23.1%	21	70.0%	4	57.1%	31	49.2%
PARTICIPATION IN ASSOCIATIONS	11	42.3%	17	56.7%	5	71.4%	33	52.4%
INSTITUTIONAL LOYALTY	15	57.7%	8	26.7%	1	14.2%	24	38.1%

Some notable differences occured among the responses received on this question:

(1) Research was mentioned more frequently in Rhode Island Colleges and Public Colleges as opposed to AICS Colleges. This is understandable since most AICS Colleges are occupationally oriented, have very limited resources and endowments and stress teaching students more so than research and publication.

(2) Institutional Loyalty appears to be more important to AICS Colleges than either the Public Colleges or the Rhode Island Colleges.

(3) Community Service was indicated more frequently in the Public Colleges and Rhode Island Colleges. This apparently follows the trend of public colleges, especially community co-leges, offering community service programs and encouraging faculty to participate.

METHODS OF EVALUATING TEACHING

The most frequently mentioned methods of evaluating teaching were classroom visitations and student questionnaires. Interestingly, the AICS Colleges utilized classroom visitations to a greater extent than student questionnaires while both the Public Colleges and Rhode Island Colleges utilized student questionnaires more so than classroom visitations.

Alumni interviews ranked as the least utilized method of evaluating teaching.

Most institutions indicated more than one method of evaluating teaching. Forty-five percent(45%) of all institutions responding indicated that at least three methods of evaluating teaching are in use.

A majority of AICS Colleges utilizing three methods of evaluating teaching indicated a combination of:

(1) Classroom visitations;

(2) Student interviews;

(3) Alumni interviews.

Public Colleges utilizing three methods indicated in a majority of responses a combination of:

(1) Classroom visitations;

(2) Alumni interviews;

(3) Student questionnaires.

Of the institutions indicating a combination of two methods of evaluating teaching, the most frequently mentioned combination consisted of (1) classroom visitations and (2) student questionnaires.

Table V. on the following page summarizes responses relative to the methods of evaluating teaching.

TABLE V.

METHODS OF EVALUATING TEACHING

METHOD	(N=26) AICS NO.	%	(N=30) PUBLIC NO.	%	(N=7) RHODE ISLAND NO.	%	(N=63) TOTAL NO.	%
CLASSROOM VISITATIONS	22	84.6%	20	66.7%	5	71.4%	47	74.6%
STUDENT INTERVIEWS	10	45.4%	5	16.7%	3	42.9%	18	28.6%
FOLLOW-UP STUDIES	3	13.6%	5	16.7%	2	28.6%	10	15.9%
ALUMNI INTERVIEWS	5	22.7%	3	10.0%	0	0	8	12.7%
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES	14	63.6%	26	86.7%	6	85.7%	46	73.0%
OTHER	5	22.7%	9	30.0%	1	14.2%	15	23.8%

RESPONSIBILITY FOR EVALUATION

Table VI. presents the responses concerning the question of responsibility for evaluating faculty. In total, the colleges responded most frequently that the Academic Dean was responsible for evaluating vaculty with the department Chairmen and stucents ranking second in total responses.

In contrast, AICS Colleges responded most frequently that the Academic Dean, Department Chairmen and the President and students ranking third. Public Colleges indicated Department Chairmen most frequently with the Academic Dean and students ranking second. The Rhode Island Colleges

responded most frequently that students were responsible for evaluating faculty with Department Chairmen ranking second.

TABLE VI.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR EVALUATION

PERSON(S)	(N=26) AICS NO.	%	(N=30) PUBLIC NO.	%	(N=7) RHODE ISLAND NO.	%	(N=63) TOTAL NO.	%
PRESIDENT	12	46.2%	11	36.7%	1	14.2%	24	38.1%
VICE-PRES.	8	30.8%	15	50.0%	1	14.2%	24	38.1%
ACADEMIC DEAN	21	80.8%	25	83.3%	4	57.1%	50	79.4%
DEPT. CHAIRMEN	13	50.0%	29	96.7%	5	71.4%	47	74.6%
OTHER FACULTY	3	11.5%	13	43.3%	4	57.1%	20	31.7%
STUDENTS	12	46.2%	25	83.3%	6	85.7%	47	74.6%
SELF-APPRAISAL	10	38.5%	18	60.0%	4	57.1%	32	50.8%

CLASSROOM VISITATIONS

Of the colleges utilizing classroom visitations as a method of evaluating faculty, the majority indicated that Department Chairmen were responsible for such visitations with the Academic Dean ranking second in total responses. Public Colleges was found to be the only group in which other faculty members had responsibility for classroom visitations. Table VII. on the following page presents responses concerning the responsibility for classroom visitations.

TABLE VII.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLASSROOM VISITATION

PERSON(S)	(N=22) AICS NO.	%	(N=26) PUBLIC NO.	%	(N=5) RHODE ISLAND NO.	%	(N=47) TOTAL NO.	%
ACADEMIC DEAN	14	63.6%	12	60%	2	40%	28	59.6%
DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN	14	63.6%	18	90%	4	80%	36	76.6%
OTHER FACULTY	0	0	4	20%	0	0	4	8.5%

When responses concerning the duration of classroom visitations were compiled the most frequent response was that classroom visitations vary. Forty-seven percent(47%) of those responding to this question indicated that the duration of classroom visitations vary without specifying the criteria. Twenty-seven percent(27%) responded that classroom visitations consist of one visit while fifteen(15%) indicated two visits. Results of this question are presented in Table VIII. on the following page.

TABLE VIII.

DURATION OF CLASSROOM VISITATIONS

NO. OF CLASSES	(N=21) AICS NO.	%	(N=19) PUBLIC NO.	%	(N=4) RHODE ISLAND NO.	%	(N=44) TOTAL NO.	%
ONE	6	28.6%	5	25%	1	25%	12	27.3%
TWO	5	23.8%	1	5%	1	25%	7	15.9%
THREE	0	0	3	15%	0	0	3	6.8%
FOUR	0	0	1	5%	0	0	1	2.3%
FIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VARIES	10	47.6%	9	45%	2	50%	21	47.7%

AWARENESS OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

All colleges were asked to respond to the question of faculty awareness of evaluative criteria. Sixty-one colleges responded to this question with ninety-six and seven-tenths percent indicating that faculty members are aware of the evaluative criteria. Two AICS Colleges indicated that faculty members are not aware of the evaluative criteria.

ATTRIBUTES OF STUDENT EVALUATION

From an intensive search of the literature on faculty evaluation eight of the most prominent attributes of teaching which students are generally asked to evaluate were selected. All colleges surveyed were asked to respond as to which attributes were among those which their students are asked to evaluate. The attributes and responses are included in Table IX. below.

Of the eight attributes selected only one, "Presentation of Subject Matter", received a total response. The attribute which received the lowest response rate was "Encouragement of Critical Thinking".

TABLE IX.

ATTRIBUTES OF STUDENT EVALUATION

ATTRIBUTE	(N=16) AICS NO.	%	(N=28) PUBLIC NO.	%	(N=7) RHODE ISLAND NO.	%	(N=51) TOTAL NO.	%
SUBJECT MATTER PRESENTATION	16	100%	28	100%	7	100%	51	100%
CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES	13	81.3%	26	92.9%	7	100%	46	90.%
MASTERY OF CONTENT	14	87.5%	27	96.4%	6	85.7%	47	92.2%
ENCOURAGE CRITICAL THINKING	10	62.5%	24	85.7%	7	100%	41	80.4%
ENCOURAGE PARTICIPATION	12	75.0%	25	89.3%	7	100%	44	86.3%
FAIRNESS OF EXAMINATIONS	12	75.0%	25	89.3%	7	100%	44	86.3%
ASSIGNMENT RELEVANCE	13	81.3%	25	89.3%	7	100%	45	88.2%
AVAILABILITY	13	81.3%	23	82.1%	7	100%	43	84.3%

ORIGIN OF FACULTY EVALUATION

Colleges surveyed were asked to state the origin of their systems of faculty evaluation. Seventy-eight percent(78%) responded that faculty evaluation is optional, eighteen percent(18%) stated that faculty evaluation is by union agreement and three percent(3%) indicated that evaluation is required by law. Table X. summarizes these responses.

TABLE X.

ORIGIN OF FACULTY EVALUATION

ORIGIN	(N=24) AICS NO.	%	(N=28) PUBLIC NO.	%	(N=7) RHODE ISLAND NO.	%	(N=59) TOTAL NO.	%
LAW	0	0	2	7.1%	0	0	2	3.4%
UNION	2	8.3%	5	17.9%	4	57.1%	11	18.6%
OPTIONAL	22	91.7%	21	75.0%	3	42.9%	46	78.0%

FACULTY AWARENESS OF EVALUATIVE PROCESS

Sixty-one colleges responded to the questions concerning faculty awareness of the results of the evaluative process. In total, ninety-six percent(96%) indicated that faculty members are aware of the results. Responses to this questions appear in Table XI. below.

TABLE XI.

FACULTY AWARENESS OF EVALUATIVE PROCESS

RESPONSE	(N=24) AICS		(N=30) PUBLIC		(N=7) RHODE ISLAND		(N=61) TOTAL	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
YES	23	95.8%	29	96.7%	7	100%	59	96.7%
NO	1	4.2%	1	3.3%	0	0	2	3.3%

RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the survey point out the need for a systematic evaluative process for faculty. The system of evaluation and the goals of the evaluative process should logically follow the goals and philosophy of the individual institution. Obviously, the goals of public colleges as opposed to private colleges are different. The public colleges surveyed consisted of two and four year institutions which, in many cases, are made up of a variety of programs ranging from liberal arts to vocational-technical. In contrast, the AICS Colleges are junior and senior colleges of a vocational nature with emphasis in the business area. Career preparation is at the base of all AICS Colleges.

Therefore, it seems appropriate that the focus of a system of faculty evaluation in AICS Colleges should concentrate on teaching effectiveness. Are students being adequately prepared in their respective areas of specialization? Have the graduates of the colleges been successful in securing positions in the business community? What do employers think of the graduates of these colleges? These appear to be appropriate questions which the system of faculty evalution will be likely to uncover.

A PROPOSED SYSTEM OF FACULTY EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT

GOALS: To determine the degree to which the instructional goals of the college are being achieved.

To act as a vehicle whereby faculty members will be subjected to self-appraisal, evaluation by peers and evaluation by administration with the resulting improvement in professional competence.

RESPONSIBILITY: A Committee on Faculty Evaluation and Development composed of one member of each academic department and one represenative of administration elected on a rotating basis each year.

COMPONENTS:

(1) An annual self-appraisal by each faculty member.

(2) Classroom visitation of faculty by the respective member of the Committee.

(3) Student evaluation of faculty at the conclusion of each trimester by means of a Student Questionnaire.

(4) Follow-up studies of graduates.

(5) Annual conference between individual faculty members and the Committee on Faculty Evaluation and Development.

It is assumed that the Committee on Faculty Development and Evaluation will assume responsibility for the design of all necessary instruments including: (1) Self-appraisal forms; (2) Student questionnaires; (3) Format of Follow-Up Studies.

It is further recommended that the initial committee exercise strong leadership in order to "educate" the entire faculty to the process of evaluation and development so that the goals will be understood.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Biddle, Bruce J and William J. Ellena. Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Bromley, Ann, Daryl Johnston and Stephen Sledjeski. "Evaluation is Vital and Integral", Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. XXI Winter, 1973.

Cohen, Arthur and Florence M. Brawer. Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Eble, Kenneth E. The Recognition and Evalution of Teaching. Utah: Project to Improve College Teaching, 1970.

Gies, Frederick, and Charles Leonard. "Teacher Evaluation: An Administrative Responsibility" , Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. XXI, Winter, 1973.

Hanke, John E. "The Art of Teacher Evaluation", Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. XXI, Winter, 1973.

Howe, Harold III, "Less Teaching, More Conversation", Improving College and University Teaching, ed. by Calvin Lee, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Improving College and University Teaching. Oregon: University of Oregon Press, Vol. XXI, Winter, 1973

Katz, H.H. "A State of the Art Study on the Independent Private School Industry in the State of Illinois". Illinois: State Advisory council on Vocational Education, May, 1973 (ED 078 161)

Miller, Richard I. Evaluation of Faculty Performance. San Francisco, California: Jossey Bass, Inc., 1974.

Miller, Richard I. Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco, California: Jossey Bass, Inc., 1974.

Sikkink, Donald E. "Two Proposals for Measuring Effectiveness", Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. XXI, Winter, 1973.

Wilson, Logan. The Academic Man. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942; reprinted, New York: Octagon Books, 1964.

JOHNSON & WALES COLLEGE
ABBOTT PARK PLACE • PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND • 02903 (401) 331-1911

November 18, 1974

I am attempting to examine the existing provisions for faculty evaluation in both public and private colleges. I would sincerely appreciate your response to the enclosed questionnaire. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is included to facilitate your response.

You may rely on the fact that all information related to your institution will be held in strictest confidence.

It would be a pleasure to furnish a copy of the study upon request.

Sincerely,

Joseph E. Bukowski

Joseph E. Bukowski,
Assistant Prof. of Accounting

FACULTY EVALUATION IN PUBLIC
AND PRIVATE COLLEGES

****

1. Does your institution utilize a formal system of faculty evaluation?

_____ Yes

_____ No

2. If your college does not utilize a formal system of faculty evaluation on what basis are are faculty members promoted and/or retained?

3. Purpose of faculty evaluation(check all which apply):

_____ Retention

_____ Promotion

_____ Salary Increments

_____ Faculty Development

_____ Merit Pay

_____ Award Superior Teaching

_____ Faculty Personal Growth

_____ Other_____

4. Which areas are considered within the evaluation(check all which apply):

_____ Teaching

_____ Counseling

_____ Research and Publication

_____ Institutional Service

_____ Advising Student Groups

_____ Community Service

_____ Participation in Professional Associations

_____ Institutional Loyalty

_____ Other_____

5. How is teaching evaluated? (Check all which apply)

_____ Classroom Visitations

_____ Student Interviews

_____ Follow-up Studies

_____ Alumni Interviews

_____ Student Questionnaires

_____ Other_____

6. Who enters into the evaluation of faculty? (Check all who apply)

_____ President
_____ Vice-President
_____ Academic Dean
_____ Department Chairmen
_____ Other Faculty
_____ Students
_____ Faculty Self-Appraisal
_____ Other_____

7. Who is responsible for classroom visitations? (Check all who apply)

_____ Academis Dean
_____ Department Chairmen
_____ Faculty
_____ Other_____

8. Duration of classroom visitations.....

_____ Single class
_____ Two classes
_____ Three classes
_____ Four classes.
_____ Five classes

9. Are faculty members aware of evaluative criteria?

_____ Yes
_____ No

10. Which of the following attributes are included in the student evaluation of faculty?

_____ Presentation of subject matter
_____ Clarity of course objectives
_____ Mastery of course content
_____ Encouragement of critical thinking
_____ Encouragement of student participation
_____ Fairness of examinations
_____ Relevance of assignments
_____ Availability outside of class.

11. Is faculty evaluation...

_____ Required by law
_____ By union agreement
_____ Optional

12. Are the results of faculty evaluation made available to faculty members?

_____ Yes
_____ No